UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

ADDELL ANDC'S DECICALATION OF PREMIC TO DE			
Deoloi.	HON. STEVEN W. RHODES		
CITY OF DETROIT, MICHIGAN Debtor.	No. 13-53846		
In re:	Chapter 9		

APPELLANTS' DESIGNATION OF ITEMS TO BE INCLUDED IN THE RECORD ON APPEAL AND STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE PRESENTED ON APPEAL

Appellants, Detroit Branch NAACP, Michigan State Conference NAACP, Donnell White, individually and on behalf of Detroit Branch NAACP and Michigan State Conference NAACP, Thomas Stallworth III, individually, Rashida Tlaib, individually, and Maureen Taylor, individually, by and through their undersigned attorneys and pursuant to Fed. R. Bankr. P. 8006, hereby submit the following designation of items to be included in the record on appeal and the statement of issues presented on appeal to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan from a certain Order and Opinion denying NAACP's Motion for Relief from Stay, entered by the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of Michigan on November 6, 2013.

I. APPELLANTS' DESIGNATION OF THE RECORD

a. Docket Entries from In re City of Detroit, Case No. 13-53846

Designation Number	Filing Date	Docket Number	Description
1	07/19/13	56	Motion by Debtor to
			Extend Stay
2	07/25/13	166	July 25, 2013
			Extension Order

3	09/06/13	737	Notice of Appearance
			and Request for
			Notice
4	09/06/13	740	Motion for Relief
			from Stay
5	09/20/13	979	Response to Motion
			filed by Interested
			Party State of
			Michigan
6	09/23/13	996	Notice of Hearing on
			Motion for Relief
			from Stay
7	09/24/13	1013	Corrected Response,
			filed by Interested
			Party State of
			Michigan
8	09/26/13	1043	Objection to Motion
	37,20,20	10.0	for Relief from Stay,
			Filed by Debtor in
			Possession
9	09/26/13	1044	Brief in Opposition to
	07/20/13	1044	Petition for Order
			Lifting Stay, filed by
			Debtor in Possession
10	09/27/13	1050	Reply, filed by
10	09/27/13	1030	= -
11	10/02/13		Appellants Minute Entry, Metter
11	10/02/13		Minute Entry, Matter Taken Under
			Advisement
10	11/06/13	1536	
12	11/06/13	1330	Opinion and Order
			Denying NAACP's
10	11/09/12	1500	Motion for Relief
13	11/08/13	1580	Expedited Transcript
			Order Form of
1.4	10/02/12		Hearing 10/02/2013
14	10/02/13		Transcript of Hearing
			on NAACP's Petition
			for Relief from Stay
15	11/15/13	1745	Motion for
			Reconsideration of
			Opinion and Order
			Denying NAACP's
			Motion for Relief
			from Stay and
			Granting Phillips'
			Motion for Relief

			from Stay, filed by Snyder and Dillon ¹
16	11/18/13	1762	Notice of
			Requirement to File
			Designation
17	11/18/13	1756	Order Requiring
			Response and Setting
			Hearing Regarding
			Motion for
			Reconsideration
18	11/18/13	1759	Notice of Appeal to
			the District Court
19	11/20/13	1777	Debtor's
			Concurrence with and
			Joinder in the State's
			Motion for
			Reconsideration

b. <u>Docket Entries from NAACP v. Snyder</u>, Case No. 13-12098 (E.D. Mich. filed May 13, 2013) (for background purposes)

Designation Number	Filing Date	Docket Number	Description
20	06/27/13	16	Amended Complaint
21	07/11/13	19	Second Motion to
			Dismiss
22	08/07/13	23	Notice of Pendency
			of Bankruptcy
			Proceedings and
			Application for
			Automatic Stay
23	08/11/13	25	Response to Second
			Motion to Dismiss
24	08/15/13	26	Objection to Notice
25	08/22/13	27	Order regarding
			notice of pendency of
			bankruptcy case and
			application of
			automatic stay

¹ This motion is set for hearing by the Bankruptcy Court on December 16, 2013. However, the Court is only reconsidering the Order and Opinion as to the *Phillips* motion.

II. <u>APPELLANTS' STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE PRESENTED ON APPEAL</u>

- A. Whether the Bankruptcy Court properly applied the principles of individual and organizational standing as its basis for determining that the stay applied to the *NAACP* case?
- B. Whether the Bankruptcy Court correctly concluded that the stay applied to the *NAACP* case when the case does not relate to the bankruptcy proceeding where Petitioners are not creditors nor assert any claims against the City and the stay as applied to the *NAACP* case is not necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of the Bankruptcy Code?
- C. Whether the Bankruptcy Court erred when it denied the *NAACP* motion for relief from the July 25, 2013 Extension Order when the five factors weighed in their favor (including judicial economy, trial readiness, resolution of preliminary bankruptcy issues, creditor's chance of success on the merits and the cost of defense or other potential burdens to the bankruptcy estate); the case was not named in the City's Motion, NAACP Petitioners did not receive notice, and the Order is broadly worded to apply to any lawsuit naming Governor Snyder and former Treasurer Andrew Dillon as defendants?
- D. Whether the Bankruptcy Court properly distinguished the *NAACP* case from the *Phillips* case² (*Phillips v. Snyder*, No. 13-11370 (E.D. Mich. filed Mar. 27, 2013) where both cases involve the same Defendants and both seek declaratory relief that P.A. 436 is unconstitutional with the same qualification that the suit will only seek prospective relief and not seek the prospective invalidation of the Detroit Bankruptcy proceeding?
- E. Whether the Bankruptcy Court had the jurisdiction to address a strictly constitutional law claim, not in any way intertwined with bankruptcy law or the Bankruptcy Code?
- F. Whether the Bankruptcy Court abused its discretion when it used subjective reasoning and speculation as to the Petitioners' intentions and determined what is best for the City, over and above fundamental constitutional issues, such as voting rights?

-

² The Opinion and Order addresses two pre-petition motions for relief from the stay, the *NAACP* case and the *Phillips* case, which are companion cases currently before Judge Careem Steeh in the United States District Court. Both cases challenge the constitutionality of P.A. 436 and were filed before the City of Detroit filed for Bankruptcy in the Chapter 9 proceeding. The Bankruptcy Court ruled that the stay did not apply to the *Phillips* case but did apply to the *NAACP* case, continuing the stay in the district court before Judge Steeh.

Respectfully Submitted,

AYAD LAW, P.L.L.C.

/s/ Nabih H. Ayad___

Nabih H. Ayad (P-59518) Attorney for Petitioners 2200 North Canton Center Road, Suite 220 Canton, Michigan 48187 734-983-0500 nayad@ayadlaw.com

/s/ Melvin Butch Hollowell

MELVIN BUTCH HOLLOWELL(P-37834) General Counsel Detroit Branch NAACP 8220 Second Avenue Detroit, Michigan 48221 313-871-2087

Date: December 2, 2013 <u>butchhollowell@gmail.com</u>

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Nabih H. Ayad, counsel for Appellants, states as an officer of the Court that on December 2, 2013 that the foregoing document, Designation of Items to be Included on Appeal and Statement of Issues on Appeal, was electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court using the ECF system, and will send notification of such filing to all ECF participants registered in this matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

AYAD LAW, P.L.L.C.

/s/ Nabih H. Ayad___

Nabih H. Ayad (P-59518) Attorney for Petitioners 2200 North Canton Center Road, Suite 220 Canton, Michigan 48187 734-983-0500 nayad@ayadlaw.com